DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 951 CS 504 010

AUTHOR Thomas, David A.; Hart, Jack
TITLE The Ethics of Proof in Speech Events: A Replication.
PUB DATE Nov 82
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Forensic Association (68th, Louisville, KY, November 4-7, 1982). Earlier version presented at the Texas Speech Communication Association (October, 1982).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Codes of Ethics; Competition; Ethical Instruction; *Ethics; Higher Education; *Models; *Moral Values; *Persuasive Discourse; *Speech Instruction
IDENTIFIERS Contests

ABSTRACT

A survey attempted to determine whether forensics participants operate under a contest-oriented ethic, an educational standard, or a more general rhetorical standard of ethics. Subjects were 63 judges and 98 contestants in rhetorical events at the American Forensic Association's (AFA) National Individual Events Tournament in April 1982. A five-item forced-choice instrument, "Judgement Calls," asked respondents to label a specific situation as either a definite ethical violation, a questionable ethical behavior, or not an ethical violation. "Your Opinion," a 10-item Likert-type scale, called for respondents to express their agreement or disagreement with statements about certain ethical judgments. Results indicated that there is a major discrepancy between the ethical perspectives the subjects say they favor and the evaluations they attach to specific contestant behaviors. Contestants and judges alike still remain committed to a contest-oriented ethical system above all other perspectives. While also supporting a view of ethics tied to an academic or educational paradigm, these findings do not support a view of forensics events as rhetoric. Written comments of respondents stressed context, explaining why they wanted to avoid labeling behaviors ethical or unethical. In conclusion, the perspectives of contests and education create an ethical system that is punitive but not rewarding. Favoring a competitive ethic over a rhetorical may leave the forensic community in a vulnerable position. (Includes questionnaires and tables of results.) (JL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED222951

THE ETHICS OF PROOF IN SPEECH EVENTS: A REPLICATION

by David A. Thomas and Jack Hart
University of Houston

presented to the American Forensic Association Convention
Louisville, KY
November 5, 1982

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Texas Speech Communicaton Association, Oct. 7, 1982.

The forensics community shares a general concern within speech education to improve the teaching of ethical communication. The National Forensic League has recently enacted stringent rules of evidence for debate, and the American Forensic Association has formulated a new code of ethics for contestants and tournament administrators. The National Forensic Association, likewise, uses a document entitled "N.F.A. Guidelines for Competition," which contains the most explicit rules for governing student contest behavior of any of the organizations which sponsor national tournaments.

Except for the N.F.A.'s guidelines, contestants and judges in the individual events have had precious little help in deciding what behaviors are considered either ethical or unethical. This situation led the author to conduct a study in 1980 to identify some of the leading opinions in use among individual events participants. The study consisted of a survey of the judges and contestants at the Auburn University War Eagle Tournament, which featured the AFA set of events. The resulting report was presented at a program of the Southern Speech Communication convention in Birmingham in 1980; and a subsequent revision of that paper was submitted to the NFA Journal. It has been accepted for publication in that journal; however, production delays have prevented its appearance and distribution to the present time.

Meanwhile, the author has conducted a second study to extend and replicate the findings of the 1980 study. Whereas the earlier study was based on a very small sample (23 contestants and 23 judges) in a regional tournament, the latest study sampled the opinions of the contestants and judges in attendance at the AFA National Individual Events Tournament.

Much of the rationale for both studies is the same. In view of the fact that the earlier study has not yet appeared, copies of the manuscript are available at this convention as a point of reference. Hence, this report will merely summarize the background and rationale which appears in the earlier report. The study proceeds from the assumption that there are three basic perspectives that might be taken towards ethics in the forensics events. These include:

1. We may consider forensics events as competitions,

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
David A. Thomas
Jack Hart
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

C SS0 481 0

contests, or games, in which rules are designed for efficient tournament administration (time limits, etc.) and fairness to the contestants. Behavior by a contestant designed to circumvent the rules of fair play and gain a competitive edge is considered an ethical violation.

2. We may consider forensics events as educational activities, simulations, supplementing the classroom. Forensics events are, according to the Sedalia Conference, "laboratories" for helping students learn to communicate more effectively. Ethical rules are based on academic or scholarly standards; ethical violations are the functional equivalent to violations of an academic honesty code.

3. We may consider forensics events as actual rhetorical situations, in which persons attempt to communicate ideas and meanings to other persons. Within this perspective, contestants are persons communicating, rather than players in a game. Accordingly, the proper ethical perspective to apply to forensics events is the same as the ethical system used to evaluate rhetoric generally.

These three perspectives are not mutually exclusive, of course. In theory, they may coincide in almost all respects. In practice, however, they are not the same. They stem from different paradigms of what the forensics enterprise entails. Take the three perspectives in turn, beginning with the last. Rhetoric as a human activity entails the purposeful communication of a speaker to influence an audience. It is rare that students in a speech contest attempt to influence their judges regarding the actual, stated content of their speeches. The influence attempt is directed towards winning a superior rating when compared with other speakers in the contest. The educational model of forensics uses this competitive motive within a role playing context. It calls for the contestant and judge to simulate an actual rhetorical situation in a laboratory setting, and to learn more effective techniques through the contest activity. Finally, the contest orientation of forensics tournaments sets up rules of fairness, scheduling convenience, and so forth, which are not related either to rhetoric or to educational simulations of rhetoric.

Rules of ethical behavior are always situational, bound to a given set of human purposes and motives. We judge the ethical behavior of a person according to these varying circumstances. When a forensics tournament is based on a model of a game or contest, many of the contest rules bind the participant only within the playing of the game. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine some of our contest activities and requirements anywhere except in a speech tournament. Similarly, violations of ethical codes have ramifications only within the system or paradigm which they govern. A contestant may be disqualified from a tournament for fabricating evidence, but is not likely to be suspended from school, or arrested, for that violation. If, however, a literal

educational perspective is imposed on the contest, the coach may indeed attach an academic punishment to a contest rule violation. In at least one incident we have heard about, a student was suspended from college for fabricating evidence in a debate tournament. However, in the main, violation of a tournament's rules does not mark a contestant as an unethical person outside the tournament in "real" rhetorical situations; and ethical rules in other contexts do not necessarily affect a student's evaluation within forensics contexts.

The first version of this study included a discussion of recent theories of ethics that pertain to rhetoric generally. That discussion will not be repeated here. However, it is important to note that some contemporary theorists now dispute the notion that rhetoric is "amoral." Using a symbolic interaction approach, in which rhetoric is used to generate knowledge and social understanding, the practice of rhetoric is seen as most ethical when it most enhances the quality of life. Thus it is possible to make value judgments about the relative morality of rhetorical influence along a range from lesser to greater. It is possible to go beyond the mere prohibition of clearly immoral practices such as lying and exploitation.

This study is based on the earlier one which attempted to describe the ethical perspectives currently used by forensics participants. Do they go by a contest-oriented ethic, an educational standard, or a more general rhetorical standard of ethics?

METHOD

This survey is designed to replicate and extend the study performed at the 1980 Auburn University War Eagle tournament. At the AFA National Individual Events Tournament held at Mankato State University on April 16-19, 1982, judges and contestants in individual events classified as "rhetorical events only" were asked to complete questionnaires related to ethics in those events. There were two instruments used, based on similar instruments used in the 1980 study. Each respondent was asked to check off an identification as either a judge or contestant. Contestants were asked to check the rhetorical events in which they participated. Choices given included informative, extemporaneous, persuasive, communication analysis, and impromptu. No interpretative or dramatic events were included. Neither was after dinner speaking included among the choices, though a number of tournament participants expressed the opinion that it ought to have been.

One of the instruments used was "Judgment Calls," a five-item forced-choice instrument calling for the respondent to label a specific situation as either a definite ethical violation, a questionable ethical behavior, or not an ethical violation. The other instrument used was "Your Opinion," a ten-item Likert-type scale calling for respondents to express their agreement or

disagreement with statements of opinion about certain ethical judgments. A copy of the questionnaire is appended to this report.

Data were collected on site by the researchers by distributing copies of the questionnaire at commom meeting places such as the judging table and tournament dining facilities. At least some data was lost when questionnaires which were distributed at a tournament breakfast were not collected afterward. According to tournament records, there were 281 students competing in the events tested, and there were 98 coaches and judges in attendance. Of those, useable questionnaires were completed by 98 student contestants and 63 judges. (This sample represents 34.9 percent of the contestants and 64.9 percent of the judges present at the tournament.) Almost all of the questionnaires returned were completed fully by the respondents. Two contestants failed to complete but one of the two instruments. On a few items, one or two respondents failed to record an answer. In all calculations, such as percentage of responses, the total of actual responses was used as the baseline denominator.

Caution must be used in drawing conclusions from the results of this questionnaire. Although the sample is larger than the one used in the 1980 study, it still remains a relatively small sample. Moreover, it is a select sample, taken as it was from the national championship tournament's participants. No attempt was made to take a random sample of participants from among schools not in attendance at this tournament, nor from the much larger (and probably somewhat different) population of high school forensics participants. On its face, this study reports the opinions of a sample of national tournament participants about the items covered on the questionnaire. To a certain extent, these persons may be considered as a good sample, because their presence at this type of tournament indicates a high level of proficiency and involvement in the forensics realm. But they cannot be considered as a representative sample of the whole community of forensics educators and students. On the other hand, when the results show a heavy preference for ethical positions that correspond with the contest perspective, this sample's selective make-up must be remembered. In other words, a different sample (such as one drawn from professors of rhetoric, or from speech department administrators, etc.) might have produced a different set of results.

RESULTS

"Judgment Calls."

The "Judgment Calls" instrument consisted of five statements which describe a contestant's behavior in a situation. Respondents were asked to check whether they regard the behavior as "a definite ethical violation," "questionable ethical behavior," or "not an ethical violation." The resulting data are displayed in Table 1, which shows the number and percentage of

responses by judges and contestants. Additionally, a chi square test was applied to the differences observed on all items to locate the opinions held most strongly by the respondents. Significant findings are also indicated in Table 1. For purposes of tabulating and testing the results, the three cells are assumed to be independent.

TABLE 1 GOES ABOUT HERE

The results of the chi square testing show that significant differences were achieved for both contestants and judges on four of the five situations. Only Item 1 produced a relatively even spread of responses across the three choices.

Item 1. An extemp speaker's file contains two dozen fully prepared speeches on topics likely to be drawn.

Responses to this item show that respondents had mixed feelings about it. Nearly equal groups of both contestants and judges selected each of the three choices. About a third considered the situation to be a definite ethical violation, another third felt that it is questionable behavior, and the remaining third believed the practice is not an ethical violation.

Items 2-5 produced near agreement among all the respondents that the situations described are all definite ethical violations. These items described the following four situations:

a speaker uses the same speech for more than one year;

a contestant in oratory fabricates an example to use in support of the speech;

a student uses a persuasive speech prepared to a great extent by the coach;

and a student plagiarizes an informative speech from a magazine article.

These findings are fairly consistent with the results of the earlier 1980 survey. The first three items on the present study were used verbatim on the earlier study. Regarding the item about the two dozen prepared extemp speeches, the contestants in 1980 thought it was a definite ethical violation but the judges' responses failed to reach a significant level of difference among the options. In the present study, neither the contestants nor the judges came to a unified opinion about the ethics of the practice. Regarding the fabricated example in an oration, the contestants in the earlier study failed to reach a significant level, but the judges did agree that the practice is a definite ethical violation. Finally, regarding the use of a speech for more than one year, all respondents in both studies agreed that the practice is a definite ethical violation.

"Your Opinion."

The "Your Opinion" instrument consisted of ten statements evaluating the ethical quality of certain forensics practices. Each of the ten statements was preceded by a Likert-type scale calling for the respondent to check whether he or she strongly disagrees, disagrees, has no opinion or is neutral, agrees, or strongly agrees with the statement. The results are displayed in Table 2, "Your Opinion," which shows the number and percentage of responses given by contestants and judges to each item. A mean score for each item was calculated by assigning a weight of 1 for strongly disagree through a weight of 5 for strongly agree. No further statistical analysis was attempted.

TABLE 2 GOES ABOUT HERE

Since no statistical tests were performed on this set of data, it is not possible to identify which of the findings (if any) represent a significant difference among the varied scores on the ten items. These data are descriptive of the opinions recorded by the contestants and judges, and it may be readily seen from Table 1 that the respondents tended to have stronger levels of agreement on some of the items than on others.

For example, on Item 1, over 70 percent of the contestants and nearly 70 percent of the judges DISAGREED with the statement that universal human values constitute a more ethical oration than narrowly defined problems. (Consistent with 1980 study.)

On Item 4, nearly 70 percent of the contestants and about 60 percent of the judges AGREED with the statement that it is unethical for a speaker to go much overtime (and less than 20 percent disagreed). (Consistent with 1980 study.)

On Item 5, over 60 percent of contestants and over 80 percent of judges AGREED with the statement that it is unethical to come in late in order to speak last in a panel. (Consistent with 1980 study.)

On Item 6, 85 percent of contestants and nearly 80 percent of judges AGREED with the statement that fabricating evidence is the worst ethical violation a contestant can commit. (Consistent with 1980 study.)

On Item 7, 94 percent of contestants and 97 percent of judges AGREED that behavior motivated by the desire to gain an unfair competitive edge, such as distracting an opponent, should be considered an ethical violation. (In the 1980 study, contestants did not agree so strongly. In fact, at that time, 17 percent of the contestants disagreed with the statement.)

On Item 8, 60 percent of contestants DISAGREED (and only 11 percent agreed) with the statement that the most important ethical rules in rhetorical events are those specified by the contest

rules. On that item, 68 percent of the judges also DISAGREED. (New wording of old item; generally consistent with 1980 findings on similar item.)

On Item 9, over 80 percent of both the contestants and the judges AGREED that the most important ethical rules to apply to the rhetorical events are those related to educational and scholarly standards. (New wording of old item. The 1980 study used a phrase, "The only ethical standards to apply..." which was deleted in this study's version. At that time, opinions were more evenly divided on this item than they are on the present study.)

On Item 10, over 50 percent of both contestants and judges AGREED with the statement that a rhetorical forensic event should be regarded as rhetoric first and as a contest second. (Consistent with 1980 findings.)

Only on two items on the present study was there a relatively even spread of opinion across the scale of disagree-to-agree.

On Item 2, about as many agree as disagree with the statement that it is more ethical for an orator to propose a specific solution to a problem than simply to analyze a problem without offering a solution. (In the 1980 study, over 50 percent of the judges agreed with the statement.)

Likewise, on Item 3, opinions were divided on the statement that it is more ethical for an extemporaneous speech to provide an unambiguous answer to the question than one which does not. (In the 1980 study, over half of the judges disagreed with this statement.)

Generally speaking, it should not be concluded that the opinions expressed represent consensus or unanimity on any of the items, with the possible exception of Item 7 which dealt with the unethical nature of contestant behavior motivated by a desire to gain an unfair competitive edge. On all other items, there was measurable opposition to the majority opinion; and on some items, anywhere from 10-30 percent chose the response "No Opinion, or Neutral." After all, the statements consist entirely of value judgments and opinions subject to individual interpretations.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

As in the 1980 study, the items selected for both instruments, "Judgment Calls" and "Your Opinion," are designed to survey opinions about the ethical qualities of behavior within forensics activities. The items reflect the three ethical contexts discussed in the opening section of this report, which include:

1. Some items relate to an ethic based on following the rules of the contest;

2. Some items relate to academic or scholarly ethics; and

3. Some items relate to a view of the ethics of rhetoric generally.

As an initial observation, we should note that there is apparently a major discrepancy between the preferred ethical perspectives which the respondents say they favor, and the evaluations which they attach to the specific contestant behaviors which seem to stem from those ethical perspectives. Recall that on the second instrument, "Your Opinion," Items 8, 9, and 10 describe the three ethical perspectives. The Items, and the respondents' ratings of them, are repeated here:

8. The most important ethical rules to apply to the rhetorical events are those related to specific contest rules. (Some 60 percent of contestants and 68 percent of judges DISAGREED; overall, less than 20 percent agreed with this perspective.)

9. The most important ethical rules to apply to the rhetorical events are those related to educational and scholarly standards, e. g., plagiarism and original research. (Over 80 percent of both contestants and judges AGREED.)

10. A rhetorical forensics event shoud be regarded as rhetoric first and contest second. Topic, supporting material, and all other rhetorical choices should be aimed at enhancing the life of the individual, with the more significant considered as the more ethical, and vice versa. (Over 50 percent of both contestants and judges AGREED; less than 25 percent disagreed.)

At face value, then, we could conclude that the respondents overwhelmingly subscribe to an ethical perspective for forensics which is rooted in an educational paradigm; that a majority also favor a view of forensics events as the embodiment of actual rhetoric; and that the respondents reject a contest-oriented ethical perspective by a wide majority.

The discrepancy between these stated preferences and the respondents' actual ethical perspectives becomes clear when their opinions of specific contest behaviors are examined.

It seems clear that contestants and judges alike still remain committed to a contest-oriented ethical system above all other perspectives. Attitudes are most strongly felt and expressed on this survey against going overtime, acting out of unsportsmanlike motives, speaking out of the assigned order, using a speech more than one year, using a spech prepared by a coach (ghostwriter), and so forth. If these behaviors are observed in a situation outside of a contest, it is unlikely that many of us would judge them as being unethical. Yet within the forensics context, judges and participants feel more intense attitudes about these behaviors

than about any other value judgments stated on the survey. Therefore, the ethical perspective towards forensics seems to be bound to the contest situation above other possible contexts.

The survey responses also support a view of ethics as tied to an academic or educational paradigm. Here, the responses are consistent with the stated preference of a majority of the respondents for a perspective related to educational and scholarly standards. Contestants and judges alike agree that fabrication of evidence is the worst ethical violation a contestant can make; and most are agreed that plagiarism of a speech is also unethical.

As previously discussed in the 1980 study, these standards are the standards of a rationalistic approach to knowledge and to life in general, and are not limited to rhetoric or communication specifically. These standards apply equally to the pursuit of scientific knowledge and applied technologies. As applied to the forensics activities, standards founded in rationalism place a premium on the use of logic, and they probably tend to penalize artistic creativity, at least in contests which pit models of "sound reasoning" against models of dramatism and narrative rhetoric.

Finally, the survey findings do not support a view of forensics events as rhetoric, despite the 2-1 expression of agreement with such an ethical perspective when stated as an abstraction or ideal. As in the 1980 study, even though a majority of respondents agree with the statement that "A rhetorical forensic event should be regarded as rhetoric first and contest second," they strongly disagree with the principle that orations which treat "positive, universal human values (e. g., world peace) are more ethical than those which deal with narrowly focused problems and solutions (e. g., junior high school football injuries)." The respondents to this survey, as to the earlier survey, are divided over whether an oration or extemporaneous speech meets a higher ethical standard when it provides a solution to the problem under discussion. As we have seen in the 1980 study, these principles are directly relevant to a consideration of the ethics of rhetoric.

In this project, respondents were invited to write comments to qualify or explain their answers to any of the items on either questionnaire instrument. There were several written comments. Almost all of the written comments were related to items on the "Your Opinion" questionnaire, reported as Table 2. Most were written by respondents who marked their own opinion as either strongly disagree, disagree, or neutral. Almost all were in the minority position, except on Item 1 where disagreement was the rule rather than the exception.

Because some of these comments may shed light on the subject of the ethical views of the respondents to the survey, we shall discuss them here. Table 3 shows the distribution of written comments according to which items were questioned as ethical

matters, and also how the respondents marked their opinions on the items in question.

TABLE 3 GOES ABOUT HERE

Notice that Items 1-4 inspired the most verbal feedback. Regarding this group of items, one respondent wrote, "Questions of wisdom, skill, audience analysis and adaptation, are not specifically ethical questions." Several commented about one or another of these items that the behavior mentioned might be stupid, but not unethical.

Items 8-10 also inspired a few comments, which were the ones about the preferred ethical perspective to govern forensics practices. Typically, the comments made the point that it is difficult or impossible to rank order a hierarchy of ethical perspectives; they also commented that existing tournament rules, ethical codes, etc., are too ambiguous to apply to these items with any precise meaning. One comment compared an ethical code for forensics with the parameters in NDT debate, that are neither ethical nor unethical, whether considered as binding or not.

There were also a few general comments related to the survey as a whole. "I see a difference between 'illegal' and 'unethical,' and also between 'ethical' and 'good speaking.' These may co-exist but they are not synonymous," wrote one coach. Another wrote, "...most of the questions...regard rule violations and differences between poor rhetoric and better rhetoric, but I don't think a poor speech means the speaker is unethical." Likewise, a contestant noted that "most of these questions are about the quality, not the ethics, of a speech."

John Wallen, one of the coaches who participated in the survey, seemed to appreciate the purpose of the project when he wrote, "I seriously think that a major problem area for forensics professionals and participants is how we define unethical behavior, and whether the moral 'ought' question implies (or to what degree it implies) the 'good practice' question, and vice versa." Indeed, one of the ethical perspectives which might be applied in forensics is that of rhetoric generally. Item 10, to which a majority of respondents gave assent, sets out an ethical perspective which evaluates the quality of a speech as an ethical dimension, with "the more significant considered as the more ethical and vice versa." Yet at the same time, a majority of respondents disagreed with Item 1 in which the point at issue was whether the more significant should be considered the more ethical. The written comments make explicit the confusion, if not the refutation, of the relevance of a broader ethical framework to forensics.

Many of the comments seemed to be designed to generate contextual situations, alternative scenarios, exceptions, and mitigating circumstances for the specific behaviors described in the questionnaire. For instance, two respondents wrote that it is

unethical for a speaker to go much overtime "only if the judge is not keeping time." Two other respondents challenged, "Define 'much'." Regarding the item about a speaker coming in late in order to speak last, one respondent wrote that "it is okay if double-entered," and another wrote that it "depends on the tournament rules." Presumably, it would be rated as unethical if it were against the tournament rules.

Similarly, of the few comments inspired by the first instrument, "Judgment Calls," the respondents seemed to gear their remarks toward drawing out fine distinctions not stated in the items. One judge wrote that the coach-written oration is "not unethical for beginners." Two comments said that the extemper's two dozen prepared speeches are not unethical "unless used in a tournament." One contestant offered the interesting comment that all of the items reflect unethical behavior by coaches, not contestants, unless the contestant performs such behaviors in overt violation of a coach's instructions.

Clearly, many of the comments were aimed at explaining why the respondents wanted to avoid labeling behaviors or judgments as ethical or unethical. Some of the comments seemed to want to offer conditions or qualifications to justify some of the behaviors under tournament rules or the circumstances of competition. As arguments, many of the comments could be used to support a contention that rhetoric as such is amoral; therefore, forensics-as-rhetoric is not a viable position upon which to base ethical judgments of contestant behavior.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This survey suggests that forensics participants, contestants and judges alike, view the rhetorical speaking events as contests or games and not as samples of rhetoric or communication. The rules of the contests currently define what is considered to be unethical, but beyond the prohibition of certain rule violations, participants share little agreement of what is considered to be ethical. The rules of scholarship and rationalism are accepted as a sort of proxy ethical system, but even here the ethical norm is limited to prohibiting violations of rules, such as not fabricating evidence or plagiarizing speeches.

The first and most obvious implication of this finding is that the ethical system is punitive but not rewarding. A contestant may be penalized and ostracized for violating a contest rule; but there is no corresponding reward to the contestant for demonstrating or applying a higher ethical standard to the performance of the event. The current contest-oriented perspective towards the ethics of individual events means that you can lose if you employ the wrong principles, but you will not be rewarded if you employ the right ones. In fact, given the results of the study, it may be possible that some judges will punish a contestant who attempts to employ a higher ethical standard. This

situation might easily develop when a contestant deviates from the rationalistic model by using a more subjective, impressionistic, dramatistic mode of oration before a judge who rejects such rhetorical strategies.

Thus, as stated in the earlier study, it may be counterproductive to attempt to tie a contest behavior to a general ethic of rhetoric. This survey's findings indicate a polarization of attitudes towards an ethical system that is not contest-oriented.

Another implication follows from this one. As long as forensics participants elevate a competitive ethic over a rhetorical ethic, the forensics community remains vulnerable to charges of being irrelevant or counterproductive to the educational aims of the departments of speech which support them. The usual justification offered for sponsoring forensics programs and activities is that they are laboratories for the study and practice of rhetorical skills. If, instead, the activities exist for the sake of developing excellence in contest techniques not tied to rhetoric, then forensics educators and coaches should consider the possibility that they will be called to account to administrators who are espressing the same critical skepticism towards the cost-benefit ratio of the activity that debate programs have experienced in recent years.

AFA NIET 1982

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE, Rhetorical Events ONLY

__ Informative
__ Extemporaneous
__ Persuasive
__ Communication Analysis
___Impromptu

Demographic Data:

Name_____

School_____

Address_____

_____

I am a COACH CONTESTANT in one or more of
(circle one)

the listed events (check events).

* *

The purpose of the study is to survey current opinions about the ethics of certain practices in the speaking events. A previous study along the same lines was conducted at a local school tournament, and the results are scheduled for publication. This survey questionnaire is designed to replicate and extend that earlier study, using the participants of the AFA NIET as the data base. We would like to have 100% participation by all coaches and contestants involved in the rhetorical speaking events.

The above demographic data is needed only to validate the scope of participation in the study. No responses will be attributed to individuals by name or school. All data will be tabulated and presented in statistical form. If deemed necessary, the researcher will use the demographic data as a key to followup inquiries and to request participation from eligible potential respondents.

Please complete both pages of this survey questionnaire. Do not omit any items. Your opinion is what is called for; it is not considered that there are "right" or "wrong" answers. If you feel compelled to qualify or explain any answer, you may do so on the back of the sheet. However, select only one response on each item per se. NOTE: To safeguard the integrity of the responses, you must complete the identification block on this page. QUESTIONNAIRES WITHOUT IDENTIFIABLE RESPONDENTS CANNOT BE USED IN THE TABULATION.

When you have completed the questionnaire sheets, turn in your survey booklet at the Judging/Information Table.

The researcher is Dr. David Thomas of the University of Houston.

I. Judgement Calls. In these situations, how would you judge the students behavior? Use the following scale:

NOT = This is not an ethical violation.
? = This is questionable ethical behavior.
IS = This is a definite ethical violation.

Not	?	IS	
___	___	___	1. An Extempt speaker's file contains two dozen fully prepared speeches on topics likely to be drawn.
___	___	___	2. An informative speaker uses the same speech for than one year of competition.
___	___	___	3. In an oration about seat belt usage, a contestant has an illustration about how his sister was horribly injured in an accident because she did not use seat belts. The orator has no sister.
___	___	___	4. A coach writes the outline, provides the research, and edits the final draft of a persuasive speech for one of his students. The student uses it in a tournament.
___	___	___	5. A contestant in informative speaking uses a magazine article in toto, verbatim, as the complete speech, without crediting or revealing the source.

II. Your opinion. Mark the scale to reflect your opinion of each statement.

SD = Strongly Disagree
D = Disagreee
N= No Opinion, or Neutral
A = Agree
SA = Strongly Agree

SD	D	N	A	SA	
—	—	—	—	—	1. Orations which promote positive, universal human values (e.g., world peace) are more ethical than those which deal with narrowly focused problems and solution (e.g., junior high school football injuries).
—	—	—	—	—	2. Orations which advocate specific solutions are more ethical than orations which analyze a problem without suggesting or supporting any given solution.
—	—	—	—	—	3. Extemporaneous speeches which furnish an unambiguous answer to the question are more ethical than those which do not.
—	—	—	—	—	4. It is unethical for a speaker to go much overtime.
—	—	—	—	—	5. It is unethical for a speaker listed in the middle of his speaking order to come late in order to speak last.
—	—	—	—	—	6. Fabricating evidence is the worst ethical violation a contestant can commit in a rhetorical forensic event.
—	—	—	—	—	7. Student behavior motivated by the desire to gain an unfair competitive edge, such as distracting an opponent, should be considered an ethical violation.
—	—	—	—	—	8. The most important ethical rules to apply to the rhetorical events are those related to specific contest rules. Practices not covered by the rules should be considered as neither ethical or unethical.
—	—	—	—	—	9. The most important ethical rules to apply to the rhetorical events are those related to educational and scholarly standards, e.g., plagiarism and original research.
—	—	—	—	—	10. A rhetorical forensic event should be regarded as rhetoric first and contest second. Topic, supporting material, and all other rhetorical choices should be aimed at enhancing the life of the individual, with the more significant considered as the more ethical and vice versa.

TABLE 1: SURVEY OF 1982 AFA NIET CONTESTANTS & JUDGES

Judgment Calls

ITEM	NOT		?		IS		BLANK	
	N	%	N	%	N	%		X^2
1C	33	34.7	25	26.3	36	37.9	4	2.06
1J	21	33.3	19	30.1	23	36.5	-	0.62
2C	6	6.3	4	4.2	84	88.4	1	*130.12
2J	3	4.8	2	3.2	58	92.1	-	*32.6
3C	6	6.3	33	34.7	56	58.9	-	*39.16
3J	5	7.9	16	25.3	42	66.6	-	*34.38
4C	6	6.3	22	23.2	66	69.5	1	*60.37
4J	5	7.9	13	20.6	44	69.8	1	*40.4
5C	7	7.4	2	2.1	86	90.5	-	*138.78
5J	0	-	0	-	63	100.0	-	*189.00

N = Contestants 95
Judges 63

2 DF X^2 Distribution

*.001 = 13.816 (All reached .001 except 1C & 1J)

TABLE 2: SURVEY OF 1982 AFA NIET CONTESTANTS & JUDGES

Your Opinion

Item		SD (=1)		D		N		A		SA (=1)		Blank	$\bar{X}$
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
1C	98	41	41.8	31	31.6	18	18.3	7	7.1	1	1.0	-	1.9
1J	60	22	34.9	22	34.9	12	19.0	3	4.8	1	1.6	3	1.9
2C	96	14	14.3	16	16.3	22	22.4	33	33.7	11	11.2	2	3.1
2J	60	13	20.6	10	15.9	11	17.5	23	36.5	3	4.8	3	2.7
3C	97	9	9.2	27	27.6	24	24.5	27	27.6	10	10.2	1	3.0
3J	61	15	23.8	9	14.3	20	31.7	14	22.2	3	4.8	2	2.6
4C	98	4	4.1	12	12.2	13	13.3	58	58.8	31	31.6	-	3.8
4J	60	6	9.5	5	7.9	11	17.5	25	39.7	13	20.6	3	3.4
5C	94	7	7.1	9	9.2	16	16.3	36	36.7	26	26.5	4	3.5
5J	61	1	1.6	✓ 4	6.3	5	7.9	21	33.3	30	47.6	2	4.1
6C	98	1	1.0	10	10.2	3	3.1	30	30.6	54	55.1	-	4.3
6J	62	1	1.6	9	14.3	2	3.2	21	33.3	29	46.0	1	4.0
7C	95	1	1.0	0	-	1	1.0	24	24.5	69	70.4	3	4.5
7J	63	0	-	1	1.6	1	1.6	12	19.0	49	77.7	-	4.7
8C	96	19	19.4	40	40.8	26	26.5	7	7.1	4	4.1	2	2.3
8J	61	13	20.6	30	47.6	7	11.1	9	14.3	2	3.2	2	2.2
9C	96	1	1.0	5	5.1	18	18.3	52	53.1	20	20.4	2	3.8
9J	62	3	4.8	6	9.5	1	1.6	29	46.0	23	36.5	1	4.0
10C	97	5	5.1	16	16.3	25	25.5	26	26.5	25	25.5	1	3.5
10J	59	3	4.8	8	12.7	11	17.5	27	42.9	10	15.9	4	3.3

N:
C = 63
J = 98

Table 3: Respondents Questioning Definition of Item as Ethical Issue

			Your Opinion				
Item	Total		SD	D	N	A	SA	Blank
1C	10	21	4	2	4	0	0	0
1J	11		5	1	3	0	0	2
2C	8	21	3	1	3	1	0	0
2J	13		3	3	4	1	0	2
3C	11	19	2	0	5	1	0	0
3J	8		3	1	3	3	0	1
4C	4	12	2	0	2	0	0	0
4J	8		1	1	2	2	0	2
5C	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
5J	2		0	0	1	1	0	0
6C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6J	0		0	0	0	0	0	0
7C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7J	0		0	0	0	0	0	0
8C	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
8J	4		0	2	1	1	0	0
9C	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
9J	0		0	0	0	2	0	0
10C	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	0
10J	2		0	0	0	2	0	0

Questioned But No Item Identification: J 4, C 2, 6